

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Cen

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/544,191	03/29/2006	Koji Hayashi	89950/JLT	8137	
1333 7590 11/29/2007 EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY			EXAMINER		
PATENT LEGA 343 STATE ST	AL STAFF		ZIMMERMAN, JOSHUA D		
i i	NY 14650-2201		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2854		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	-	
Office Action Summary		10/544,191	HAYASHI, KOJI		
		Examiner	Art Unit	-	
		Joshua D. Zimmerman	2854		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet with t	ne correspondence address	_	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in a solid part of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAND	TON. De timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a) <u></u> □	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 Sec</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters,	·		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)	Claim(s) 1,2,4,8,9 and 11 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1,2,4,8,9 and 11 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examine	vn from consideration. r election requirement.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the Extended in the content of the con	epted or b) objected to by t drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ion is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
2) Notice 3) Information	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/M	nary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application		

Application/Control Number: 10/544,191

Art Unit: 2854

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leenders et al. (US 5908731).

Regarding claim 1, Leenders et al. disclose "a lithographic printing plate precursor (abstract), comprising on a substrate (column 2, line 26), an oleophilic layer (column 2, line 29) containing a cross-linked product (column 2, lines 30-31), that was obtained by crosslinking a polymer having a heat decomposable group that is an azo, diazo, dioxy, disulfide, hydrazide, nitro, onium salt, sulfonic ester, disulfonyl, or thiosulfonic group in the main chain with a cross-linking agent (column 5, lines 1-2 and column 6, lines 36-38), said polymer, prior to crosslinking, has a functional group that is capable of reacting with said cross-linking agent (column 5, lines 1-2 and column 6, lines 36-38),

the printing plate precursor further comprising a hydrophilic layer between said substrate and said oleophilic layer (column 7, lines 66-67),

said printing plate precursor also containing a photo-to-heat converting material either in said oleophilic layer or said hydrophilic layer (column 8, lines 11-12)."

Regarding claim 2, Leenders et al. further disclose "wherein said heat decomposable group is an azo group (column 5, lines 1-2)."

Regarding claim 4, Leenders et al. further disclose "wherein said substrate has a hydrophilic surface (column 2, line 26)."

Regarding claim 8, Leenders et al. teach "a method for preparing a lithographic printing plate (example 1) comprising:

exposing the lithographic printing plate precursor of claim 1, to IR radiation and removing the exposed part of said oleophilic layer (column 9, lines 30-39)."

Regarding claim 9, Leenders et al. further teach "mounting the exposed lithographic printing plate precursor directly on a printer without developing (column 9, lines 37-43, column 8, lines 51-57. Examiner points out here that the rubbing step of Leenders et al. is not a development step, but rather a 'cleaning' step)."

Regarding claim 11, Leenders et al. further teach "wherein said polymer having a heat decomposable group is used in combination with another thermally decomposable compound (column 5, lines 59-63 or column 6, lines 50-52. Examiner also notes that any of the other compounds used by Leenders et al. are thermally decomposable, as all organic compounds are thermally decomposable)."

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/06/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

Application/Control Number: 10/544,191

Art Unit: 2854

(i.e., the crosslinked polymer has heat decomposable groups and that the heat decomposable groups participate in imaging or that the azo compounds are present after crosslinking) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As presently claimed, the printing plate precursor requires only an oleophilic layer containing a crosslinked product that was obtained by crosslinking a polymer having a heat decomposable group with a crosslinking agent. As outlined above (and admitted by applicant in the second full paragraph of page 6 of applicant's remarks filed 4/04/2007), the precursor of Leenders et al. anticipates this limitation since the precursor of Leenders et al. contains a hydrophobic layer which is obtained by crosslinking a compound with a heat-decomposable group with a crosslinking agent (column 5, lines 1-2).

3. In response to applicant's argument that Leenders et al. use titanium dioxide particles for a different reason than applicant, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Zimmerman whose telephone number is 571-

Application/Control Number: 10/544,191 Page 5

Art Unit: 2854

272-2749. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8:30A - 6:00P, Alternate Fridays 8:30A-5:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joshua D Zimmerman Examiner Art Unit 2854

jdz

JUDY NGUYEN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

zu dy Ngugen